

<p style="text-align: center;">Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</p>	<p>Application No. 10/530,176</p>	<p>Applicant(s) KELLY, GRAHAM EDMUND</p>
	<p>Examiner Benjamin Packard</p>	<p>Art Unit 1612</p>

All Participants:

(1) Benjamin Packard

(2) Deb Sengupta

Date of Interview: 13 January 2010

Type of Interview:
☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Status of Application: non-final

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: 3pm

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
all

Claims discussed:
1-4 8-10 23

Prior art documents discussed:
Kelly et al (WO98/008503) and Ekwuribe et al (US 6,380,405).

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
Discussed the claims in light of the unexpected showings. Also discussed the difference between the method and composition claims. Applicants intended to discuss these matters with their clients.

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Benjamin Packard/
Examiner, Art Unit 1612

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)